

From: [HOPE Bruce](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Cc: [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [PETERSON Jenn L](#); [ANDERSON Jim M](#)
Subject: RE: FW: Modeling Meeting
Date: 06/14/2006 08:20 AM

Eric,

The meeting is ostensibly about who data the T&F model needs from the hydrodynamic model and how that exchange would actually take place. I say ostensibly because its not always clear what all the other agendas are in a given meeting. They wanted to have this meeting sooner than later because of the Phase 2 report but I think the timing should also be dictated by who needs to be there and their availability. Which is why I'm fairly uncomfortable going to such a meeting as the sole representative of the agency side. Definitely need to talk about this.

I did speak to Jennifer yesterday about the food web model. The two issues were adding a couple of more species and what spatial scale the model would address.

On the first, I'm resisting adding more species for which we have no data and which are just variations on the two equations which describe invertebrates. In a subsequent conversation with Nancy and John at Windward, we agreed to hold off (at least through PRG development) adding more compartments but to change the name of "clam" and "crayfish" to "benthic invertebrate (filter feeder)" and "benthic invertebrate (detritivore)" to better reflect what the underlying equations are really doing. I think adding more compartments should be contingent on an agreement to collect data for those compartments - otherwise model calibration isn't possible. On a slightly different tack, yesterday I sent Nancy copies of the food web model in 3 different formats (the A&G template, a spreadsheet, and VBA code) that I carefully made sure exactly replicated each other. This was because she was hesitant to use the model until everything matched. I had hoped that this would allow us to continue to share information about the food web model as we went along, rather than wait until an incomprehensible 200+ page report arrives for review. Her comments suggested that Windward is now going to go off and work on the model in private and we're on the big report review path. This is an unfortunate outcome that I'd hoped we could avoid.

On the second, spatial scale isn't really about the food web model per se but about how you characterize the spatial scale of the exposure point concentration going into the model and that of the PRG coming out of it. Windward has used a spatially weighted average concentration as the exposure point concentration input to the food web model. I asked Nancy if they'd ever been asked to explain in detail how they came up with this value - she said no. Clearly, you need to know (and agree with) what assumptions they used to derive this value - making this an issue that needs to be addressed. On the other side, there is the matter of how spatial scale applies to the PRG. To me, a PRG is scale-free and what matters is how you derive the exposure point concentration that you are going to compare it against. Thus far, Windward/LWG has used weighted average concentrations, an approach which too easily obscures scale-sensitive features like hotspots, specific SMAs, outfalls, etc. There is concern (on both Jennifer's and my part) that they might expect to continue with "average" PRGs. Thus this is also an issue that needs to be hashed out before we get too far into PRG development.

Bruce

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2006 5:35 PM
To: HOPE Bruce
Cc: humphrey.chip@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Re: FW: Modeling Meeting

Bruce, let's talk about the meeting and what the purpose is. Also, as you may have heard from Jennifer (and others) there are some loose ends on the food web model issue resolution. Jennifer wants to talk tomorrow. I will check in with Jennifer but perhaps the three of us should talk.

Eric

HOPE Bruce
<HOPE.Bruce@deq.state.or.us>

06/13/2006 09:18 AM

Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
cc

Subject

FW: Modeling Meeting

Eric / Chip,
Who else would you like to attend this meeting with me? I think someone from EPA (Ben?) should be there too. And it is in Olympia so the driving is a little easier. Bruce

-----Original Message-----
From: Carl Stivers [mailto:cstivers@anchorenv.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2006 8:36 AM
To: HOPE Bruce
Cc: Gene Revelas; Ray Walton; Nancy Judd; johnt@windwardenv.com; kpine@integral-corp.com; Valerie Oster; rjw@nwnatural.com; McKenna, James (Jim); ricka@bes.ci.portland.or.us
Subject: Modeling Meeting

Bruce -

The best date for LWG folks is Tuesday June 27 at 10 am at Integral's Olympia office. Hopefully, that still works for you. Let me know if it does not.

Thanks.

Carl

Carl Stivers
Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
1423 3rd Avenue, Suite 300
Seattle, WA 98101-2226
Phone: 206-287-9130
Fax: 206-287-9131

cstivers@anchorenv.com

This electronic message transmission contains information that may be confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of litigation. The information is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify us by telephone at (206) 287-9130, or by electronic mail, cstivers@anchorenv.com.